


IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION



TEEL STYLES,  
Plaintiff,

v.

FELLOWSHIP CHURCH and EDWIN  
BARRY YOUNG,  
Defendants.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

No. 3:17-CV-2199-C

**FINDINGS CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION**  
**OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and an order of the District Court, this case has been referred to the United States Magistrate Judge. The findings, conclusions and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge follow:

**I. Background**

Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se* and the Court has granted her leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Defendants are Fellowship Church and Edwin Barry Young. The Court has not issued process, pending preliminary screening.

Plaintiff's complaint is unclear. She claims Defendants engaged in prostitution, harassment, and slander. She states she filed a complaint against Defendant Edwin Barry Young with the EEOC. She includes a letter from the EEOC in which the agency states that it lacks jurisdiction over the complaint because Defendant Young is not Plaintiff's employer. Plaintiff also alleges that a person named "Michelle," who worked in a preschool ministry committed an act of premeditated murder towards Plaintiff's child. She claims there were hidden cameras in

her residences in Texas and North Carolina. She appears to claim the Defendants conspired with home builders, police officers and others to place hidden cameras on her home's roof top, power outlets, shower, and kitchen. She also claims her phone calls were recorded. She seeks prosecution of Defendants, an investigation, and money damages.

## **II. Discussion**


A district court may summarily dismiss a complaint filed in forma pauperis if it concludes, inter alia, that the action is "frivolous or malicious." 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(B)(i). A claim is factually frivolous when "the facts alleged are 'fantastic or delusional scenarios' or the legal theory upon which a complaint relies is 'indisputably meritless.'" *Harris v. Hegmann*, 198 F.3d 153, 156 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1999); *see also Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 32-33 (1992).

Plaintiff's complaint recites fantastic charges which are fanciful and delusional in nature. Dismissal is warranted under these circumstances. *See, e.g., Patterson v. U.S. Government*, No. 3:08-CV-1730-K, 2008 WL 5061800 (N.D. Tex. Nov. 25, 2008) (dismissing complaint alleging plaintiff was being tracked by a remote control bracelet and that someone at a family crisis center threatened to put her in a dungeon); *Melton v. American Civil Liberties Union*, No. 3:07-CV-856-M, 2007 WL 2263953 (N.D. Tex. Jul. 30, 2007) (dismissing complaint alleging ACLU and its attorneys, acting as Russian agents, violated plaintiff's civil rights by using the courts to establish a communist government); *Daniel v. FBI*, No. 3:03-CV-1281-N, 2003 WL 21436479 (N.D. Tex. Jun. 17, 2003), *rec. adopted*, 2003 WL 21555130 (N.D. Tex. Jul. 8, 2003) (dismissing complaint alleging the FBI stalked, harassed, and tried to poison plaintiff because she ran as a write-in candidate for President of the United States). The Court recommends that Plaintiff's complaint be dismissed.

### **III. Recommendation**

The Court recommends that the complaint be dismissed with prejudice pursuant to the 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

Signed this 20 day of November, 2017.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul D. Stickney", written over a horizontal line.

PAUL D. STICKNEY  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR SERVICE AND  
NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL/OBJECT**

A copy of this report and recommendation shall be served on all parties in the manner provided by law. Any party who objects to any part of this report and recommendation must file specific written objections within 14 days after being served with a copy. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b). In order to be specific, an objection must identify the specific finding or recommendation to which objection is made, state the basis for the objection, and specify the place in the magistrate judge's report and recommendation where the disputed determination is found. An objection that merely incorporates by reference or refers to the briefing before the magistrate judge is not specific. Failure to file specific written objections will bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge that are accepted or adopted by the district court, except upon grounds of plain error. *See Douglass v. United Services Automobile Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996).